U.S.. HQ 8[illegible]

THE

NATIONAL LEAGUE

FOR THE

PROTECTION

OF THE

FAMILY

Annual Report for 1910

THE
National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

Treasurer.

Wolcott H. Johnson, Care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Center.

Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst

Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.

Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester

Everett O. Fisk, Esq., Boston.

Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1910

BOSTON:
The Fort Hill Press
Samuel Usher
176-184 High Street
1911

Notes.

1. Our Reports for the years 1890, 1892, 1897, and 1901–10 are the only ones that can now be supplied. The Report for 1905 is a "Review of Twenty-Five Years," giving a summary of the movement regarding the family and our work for that period, and will be freely sent to all who ask for it.

2. The paper of the Corresponding Secretary read before the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis, on the "Problem of the Family," and a report of twenty pages of a Committee on the Family, with Prof. A. R. Merriam, chairman, made to the National Council of Congregational Churches in October, 1907, has been reprinted from the minutes of the Council and will also be sent to those who desire it. An address by the Secretary on "Some Fundamentals of the Divorce Question" may also be had on application.

3. The Report of the Census Office on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and some twenty foreign countries, in two volumes, can be had on application to the Director of the Census, Washington, D. C.

4. A summary of this Report, of twenty pages, has been prepared by the League and will be sent to all who may write the Secretary for it, enclosing a postage stamp.

5. The attention of all is invited to the report of the Treasurer and the need it shows of immediate and generous aid for our work.

Every friend of the home is invited to give us a modest place, at least, in his annual charities. The work of all benevolent societies is aided by everything that is done for the home. The League needs an immediate endowment. A form of bequest may be found on the third page of the cover.

6. Associate Annual Membership is offered to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of five dollars for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such members are members in full for the time.

7. The Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston, Mass., will gladly acknowledge all contributions. All other correspondence should be addressed to Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass., to whom contributions may also be sent. *It will greatly relieve us if contributions can be sent earlier than the autumn months.* Last year one third of all the receipts for the year came after December 1.

Minutes.

BOSTON, MASS., February 2, 1911.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at the Diocesan House, No. 1 Joy Street, Boston, on Thursday, February 2, 1911, at 12.30 P.M. The meeting was called to order by the senior Vice-President, Bishop Lawrence, who led in prayer. William H. Cobb was chosen Recording Secretary *pro tempore*. The records of the last annual meeting were read and approved.

Dr. Dike presented a latter from Bishop Niles, offering his resignation from the League; but by general consent his membership was continued. The Corresponding Secretary read selections from his annual report.

Voted: To accept the report and refer its publication to the discretion of the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, the Treasurer, read his annual report.

Voted: To accept the Treasurer's report when it shall have been audited by Mr. Herrick.

Voted: To reëlect the officers of the previous year.

Dr. Dike having expressed his willingness to withdraw from office if a younger and more active secretary could be obtained, such a course was deprecated by all the members present, and the League adopted unanimously, by a rising vote, the following resolution offered by President W. E. Huntington:

Resolved: That the gratitude of the League be expressed to Dr. Samuel W. Dike for his long-continued, faithful, and efficient services as Corresponding Secretary; and that our desire be thus recorded that he continue in this service.

The annual meeting was then dissolved.

WILLIAM H. COBB,
Recording Secretary pro tempore.

Report of the Corresponding Secretary.

The League now completes thirty years since its organization as the New England Divorce Reform League, and the Corresponding Secretary completes the same number of years of service. A review of the condition of things thirty years ago and what it is to-day would be interesting. But we need the space for other subjects. So those interested are referred to our Report for 1905, which was wholly given to a review of the past, and to the subsequent annual reports. There are plenty of copies of this "Review of Twenty-Five Years" for all who ask for them. A few points, however, will be noted in this report.

LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

The Uniform Marriage Bill was not completed to the satisfaction of the commissions in charge of it the past summer, and has been recommitted for amendment. It will undoubtedly be ready for the state legislatures another winter.

The Uniform Divorce Law has been enacted entire in four states. Several other states, like Massachusetts, find their present law so nearly like the proposed uniform law that it has been thought inexpedient to urge any change in their present law. The present degree of uniformity cannot, therefore, be measured by the number of states that have enacted the uniform bill.

A uniform law to check the *Desertion of Families*, prepared by the commissions on a uniform marriage law at the instance of philanthropic people, now goes to the state legislatures for their adoption. It was found that the laws of the several states on this subject were so conflicting that they were often made useless by parties migrating to other states. The general trend on many subjects here, and in Continental Europe on commercial subjects, towards uniformity of law, as well as towards international uniformity in general, helps the movement towards uniformity of family law.

Few legislatures were in session in 1910, and the legislation on our subjects was very little, and probably will be for some years while the uniform measures are being tried. And beyond this the feeling is growing that legislation must follow more or less the great educational work that needs to be done. Yet there is by no means stagnation. A movement has just begun in Colorado for reform. This state has for many years ranked from the worst to the third worst

state in divorce, Washington and Montana now having a higher rate. The movement seems to be well planned. It will be a good thing if this state will adopt the uniform law and thus lead the way in the Far West. Recent information from Utah, which has come to an average place in the divorce rates of the states, points to a possible effort for reform in that state also.

THE ENGLISH MOVEMENT.

The growing dissatisfaction with the English divorce law which, among other peculiarities, has restricted absolute divorce to one cause, and even then to one of the parties only except under certain conditions, has resulted in the appointment of a Royal Commission on the subject, of eminent and able persons. This commission has gone into the subject very thoroughly but has not yet made its report, the hearings having only recently been finished. Between the extremes of churchmen of certain views and the insistence of a growing democracy, together with intricate legal and social conditions, the problem is one of great difficulty. Its outcome will be watched with much interest in this country.

It has been our privilege to supply members of the Royal Commission and others interested with considerable information of various kinds from our experience in the United States and from official reports concerning the situation in other countries. It has been very gratifying to officers of the League to hear from eminent Englishmen very hearty praise of the great value of the work that has been done in this country.

MARRIAGE LAWS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The following summary by topics of the marriage laws of other countries has never been made before. It is prepared from the United States Report and will be found useful and of ready reference.

Parental Consent.

Austria requires parental consent to the marriage for all persons under twenty-four years of age. *Belgium* demands that all parties under twenty-one have parental consent and that those over twenty-one seek it, and that they must, if it is not granted, serve upon their parents an *acte respectueux* demanding consent. *Bulgaria* requires parental consent but without any age limit. If the parents or guardians do not consent, the permission of the higher church officials may be substituted. *Denmark* requires parental consent until the parties are twenty-five years old, the authorities having power to act in case of refusal. In *England*, *Canada*, and the *Australian*

Colonies generally, and in *Germany*, the limit for parental consent is at twenty-one years of age. In *France* the ages are twenty-five and twenty-one respectively. All persons above these ages must serve on their parents or grandparents the *acte respectueux;* but since the law of 1896 the forms of this are less exacting. *Hungary* requires the consent of parents or guardians until of age, which is ordinarily at twenty-four. *Italy* requires it until twenty-five and twenty-one. *Japan* puts the age for consent until thirty and twenty-five. The *Netherlands* puts it at thirty for both sexes. *Norway* fixes it at eighteen and *Roumania* at twenty-five and twenty-one. In *Servia* the matter seems to be left to the several churches. *Sweden* and *Finland* now confine the requirement to minors — persons under twenty-one. *Switzerland* puts the age at twenty for both sexes.

Prior Marriage, or Restrictions of Time.

Many foreign countries place some period of restriction on remarriage after the dissolution of a former marriage for any cause. In *Austria* no woman can remarry except after certain times. In Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, and Italy, no woman can marry until ten months after the dissolution of the prior marriage. In *Denmark* the man must wait in such cases the " one year of mourning," and the woman three months. In *Japan* the limit is at six months and in *Servia* ordinarily nine months. In *Norway* it is nine months. In *Sweden* and *Finland* it is six months for the widower and one year for the widow. In the *Netherlands* and in *Switzerland* the forbidden period is three hundred days.

Divorced Persons, Adulterers, and *Criminals.* In *Austria* the divorced person, if a Catholic, cannot marry until the death of the other party, nor can the one who occasioned the divorce. Persons who have committed adultery with each other cannot marry. In *Belgium* the guilty party in adultery cannot marry an accomplice, and in divorce by mutual consent there must be a delay of three years. But otherwise there have been no restrictions on the reunion of divorced persons since 1906. In *Bulgaria* a person who has lost a divorce suit as a defendant cannot remarry within from two to five years. In *Denmark* and *Norway* adulterers cannot marry each other except by royal concession. The guilty party in *Scotland* cannot marry an accomplice. Divorced persons cannot reunite in *France* if either of them since the divorce has contracted a new marriage that has been followed by a second divorce. In *Hungary* those divorced for adultery cannot marry again except by consent of the king. In *Italy* a person convicted of homicide either as principal or accomplice cannot marry. In *Japan* the party convicted of adultery cannot marry his accomplice. The same is true of the Netherlands and Roumania. In *Sweden* the convicted adulterer cannot marry without the consent of the other party.

Differences of Religion.

Austria forbids marriages between Christians and those not belonging to the Christian faith, and members of holy orders which exact a vow of celibacy cannot marry in Austria nor in *Hungary*, — in the latter case without the consent of ecclesiastical superiors. In *Bulgaria* condemnation to celibacy by an ecclesiastical court is a bar to marriage. *Servia* forbids marriage between Christians and non-Christians. In *Sweden*, heathen or persons belonging to no religion cannot marry.

Physical and Mental Incapacity.

Physical and mental defects of various kinds disqualify persons for marriage in many countries. In *Austria* the insane, the demented, the imbecile, and those incapacitated through such a cause as intoxication cannot marry. In *Bulgaria* mental or physical condition, if such pertains to insanity, epilepsy, or syphilis, prevents marriage. In *Denmark* and *Norway* physical disability of any kind is no hindrance to marriage; mental fitness at the time of marriage is all that is required. In *Great Britain* and its *Colonies* an unsound mind is the only physical or mental disqualification. In *Hungary* persons legally incapacitated for business, those under a curator on account of mental disease, or as deaf mutes unable to make themselves understood, cannot marry. In *Italy* those legally judged of unsound mind cannot marry. In *Servia*, incurable impotence existing at the time of the marriage is the only cause mentioned. In *Sweden* and *Finland* epilepsy only is named. In *Switzerland* lunatics and idiots cannot marry.

Military Service.

In *Austria*, in general, military persons cannot contract a valid marriage without the written permission of their superiors. The law of 1889 also provides that men shall not marry before reaching the age of military service (twenty-one years), or before leaving the third age class (i. e., at twenty-three years), except as they have been freed from this obligation of service. *Belgium* requires the consent of superior officers. *Bulgaria* has the same law. In *Denmark* and *Norway* non-commissioned officers cannot marry until they are twenty-five years old, and after that only on permission of their superiors. Privates and commissioned officers come under the latter rule. In *France* all persons in military service must have permission from their superiors. In *Germany* there is restriction only as the laws of particular states require it. In *Hungary* the law is the same as in Austria. In *Italy* officers must have royal permission. In the *Netherlands* a man between the ages of nineteen and forty, liable to military duty, cannot marry until the obligation to serve has been fulfilled. No permission is required for officers or other regular

members of the army or navy. In *Sweden* special permission is required for both officers and privates. In *Servia* privates and lieutenants are ordinarily not allowed to marry, while higher officers may marry on permission of the minister of war, and non-commissioned officers with the consent of the commander-in-chief. In *Sweden* the consent of superior officers must be had.

Banns or Publication.

In *Austria* announcement of the intended marriage with certain details, including the admonition that any one knowing of any impediment to the marriage shall give notice, must take place on three Sundays or holidays at the customary religious assembly of each of the contracting parties, or in the place of former residence if the present residence has not lasted more than six weeks. If the ecclesiastical authorities refuse either the publication or to perform the ceremony, appeal may be taken to the civil authorities and, in case they allow the marriage, the publication is then made by posting the announcement on the official bulletin board for three weeks. In certain cases dispensation from one or two of the required publications may be granted. In *Belgium* the banns must be posted on the door of the town hall of the parish on Sunday ten days before the marriage. In *Bulgaria* a betrothal in the parish church in the presence of the priest and at least two witnesses not less than three weeks before the marriage takes the place of banns, and the coming marriage must be announced on three successive Sundays before the marriage. In *Denmark* banns must be published on three successive Sundays. One publication must also be made three weeks before the marriage by the civil authorities, or a license given by certain ecclesiastical authorities for all marriages within the established church. In *England*, in the case of banns, they must be published in church or chapel for three weeks preceding the solemnization of the marriage. No limit is put on the time of the marriage of those who have special licenses from the Archbishop of Canterbury and his successors. Notices of all marriages without banns or licenses, i. e., those among Dissenters and others, must be given to the superintendent registrar of the district in which they have lived at least seven days next preceding the notice, or to the registrars of both districts if the parties do not live in the same district. These notices must be posted in the office of the registrar for twenty-one days. In *Ireland* the practice is essentially like that of England with some variations. In *Scotland* banns in regular marriages must be published three times, not necessarily on different Sundays. Registrar's certificates issue after due notice has been given and made public for seven consecutive days. In *Canada* banns or a license are required in Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward's Island, British Columbia, and the Northwest Territories. The *Australian* colonies seem to follow the English law closely. In *Finland* a legally

recognized betrothal must precede the marriage. In *France* banns must be published two successive Sundays and a copy posted on the door of the town hall in the intervening week, and if the domicile is established by less than six months' residence, the publication must also be made in the place of the last domicile. One publication must also be performed by the civil authorities within the same periods. In *Finland* banns for three successive Sundays are required, and if the bridegroom lives outside the district, he must produce a certificate from his own pastor stating that there are no impediments to the marriage. In *Germany* either banns must be announced or the civil registrar has power to announce the marriage by a notice posted for two weeks before the marriage. There is the usual regulation about notice in case one of the parties does not reside in the district or has not lived there six months. In *Hungary* notice must be posted in the communal house for fourteen days, and the marriage cannot then take place until three days more. There are several other regulations to be observed, among them one requiring that there be presented, on application for the license, the official records of the dissolution or annulment of any former marriage. In *Italy* the regulation is the same as in France, except notice in the place of former residence must be made unless the present residence has been for one year. In the *Netherlands* the registrar must proclaim the banns before the door of the town hall on two consecutive Sundays and a written notice posted during the week between, with the usual condition in case of a residence less than six months. In *Norway* one publication of banns is sufficient, and this can be dispensed with if necessary. In *Roumania* the publication must be for two Sundays before the door of the parish church and that of the town hall, and the marriage cannot be celebrated until the fourth day after the second publication. In *Servia* the banns must be published on three successive Sundays or holy days before a marriage. In *Sweden* the same rule holds as in Servia except that in certain grave cases the banns may be omitted. In *Switzerland* banns must be published fourteen days before the license can issue.

There are many details in most countries regulating the matter of banns and publication, for which the reader is referred to the digest of the laws given in the United States Report, Part I.

Hour of Marriage.

This does not seem to be fixed by law except in England, and many of its American and Australian colonies, where it is from eight o'clock in the morning to some hour in the afternoon not later than six.

Celebration.

Bulgaria and *Servia* have religious marriage only, but dissenters, and in Servia those not of the Greek Church, may be married accord-

ing to the forms of their own faiths. In *Austria* marriage may be either religious or civil in certain cases, and must be civil for those of religions not legally recognized. Where the civil marriage is obligatory, a religious ceremony may follow the civil ceremony, but may not precede it. In *England* and its colonies, either a religious or a civil ceremony is legal. In *Norway* and *Sweden* the religious ceremony is the rule, but civil marriage is the form for those not of the state or Lutheran church. Civil marriage with an optional religious ceremony to follow the legal form is the only lawful marriage in *Belgium*, *France*, *Germany*, *Hungary*, *Italy*, the *Netherlands*, *Roumania*, and *Switzerland*.

Record.

An official record of all marriages by the civil authorities seems to be required in all civilized countries except in *Servia* and *Sweden*, where the record must be made by the ecclesiastical authorities. In one or two countries, however, the digest of the laws does not give positive evidence of the requirement for record. The record must always be made in the civil community where the marriage takes place, and that is always in the place where one or both parties reside.

Uniform Laws.

Uniform marriage laws were enacted in *Germany*, February 6, 1875, but complete uniformity in regard to impediments to marriage and the grounds of divorce did not take place until the uniform divorce law that went into effect January 1, 1900. *Hungary* enacted a uniform marriage law for the entire kingdom, except Croatia and Slavonia, in 1894. *Switzerland* has a uniform federal law regulating both marriage and divorce, which went into effect January 1, 1876.

Marriages of Foreigners and Foreign Marriages.

Austria, *Belgium*, *England*, *France*, *Germany*, *Hungary*, and *Japan* report some law touching the marriage of foreigners in those countries or of their own citizens in foreign countries. With some modifications the general rule seems to be that a country recognizes a marriage of its own citizens contracted abroad if it has been made according to the law of the place where contracted, and if it does not conflict with the law of the home country. In some cases the marriage must be before the consul or other official representative of the country to which the parties belong. Generally, foreigners may be married in any other country but their own according to the law of the country, provided that certain facts are certified.

Annulment and Void or Voidable Marriages.

In *Austria* marriages may be annulled either on considerations of public policy or private rights. In *Bulgaria* marriages contrary to

the blood impediments or those with persons of mental or bodily disease are null. In *Belgium* and *France* certain marriages are void without the interference of the courts. Other marriages are liable to annulment when contracted contrary to the impediments or when there has been some defect in certain formalities. In *Denmark* and *Norway* marriages contrary to the impediments of relationship are void. Others contrary to the legal regulations seem to be voidable. In *England* marriages are void *ab initio* when the parties are within the prohibited degrees, or of unsound mind, or either has a spouse still living. Marriages are voidable if contrary to certain statutory provisions, if the consent was obtained through fraud or either party is impotent. The rest of *Great Britain* and the Colonies seem to follow the law of England. In *Finland* marriages are voidable or void if contracted in spite of existing impediments, with certain qualifications. In *Germany* marriages are void if any of the essential prerequisites have been lacking, with some qualifications. Voidable marriages are of two kinds. In the first class the action for nullity may be brought by one of the parties, by the state's attorney, or by an interested third party. In the second class one of the parties must be the plaintiff and the other party the defendant. The first kind of voidability is the equivalent of the English nullity. In *Hungary* marriages may be annulled for various violations of the provisions regarding impediments. In some cases the marriage can be declared absolutely void and in others it is simply "impugnable." Marriages are also void if performed before an incompetent official or the consent is defective, or if one of the parties is incompetent to transact business, and are also impugnable for several other irregularities. In *Italy* marriages may be annulled if either party was under age or was bound by a former marriage, or if the parties were within the prohibited degrees. Marriages may be declared null if celebrated before an incompetent official if the suit is begun within a year or either party has been guilty of homicide. If consent was not free, the validity of the marriage may be attacked. Impotence anterior to marriage may be put forth as an objection by either party. So also the marriage when one party has been legally judged of unsound mind with certain limitations. In *Japan* marriages are void if through mistake the intention to contract marriage with a particular person did not exist, or if the parties do not make the necessary notification of the marriage to the registrar. They are voidable if contrary to the provisions of the code, if contracted through fraud or force, or, in case of the adoption of a *mukoyoshi*, on the ground of the invalidity or cancellation of the adoption. In the *Netherlands* failure to comply with any of the rules governing impediments opens the way to judgment against the offending party, all actions being termed causes for nullity. In *Roumania* the impediments seem to invalidate marriages contrary to them, apparently following French law. In *Servia* a marriage contracted notwithstanding an impedi-

ment with or without the knowledge of the parties is null, but the nullity must be established by a judicial decree. Some marriages are only relatively null and are valid until contested by certain parties. In *Sweden* bigamous marriages, and those within the prohibited degrees, or celebrated by unauthorized persons, are void. Those where other impediments exist are voidable except in two or three cases. In *Switzerland* bigamous marriages, those within the prohibited degrees, and those in case of insufficient mental capacity, are void. Certain other marriages may be annulled.

Changes in Marriage Laws.

The changes in the marriage and divorce laws of foreign countries in the last forty years are comparatively few and slight except in *Germany*, *Hungary*, and *Switzerland*, where uniform systems have taken the place of numerous and intricate systems; and in *Japan*, where state regulations of marriage and divorce have been made for the first time.

In *Austria*, since 1870, a civil marriage is obligatory where neither party belongs to one of the recognized religious Confessions. Civil marriage was first provided for in 1868, and in that year Catholics were again put under the jurisdiction of the civil courts, but according to ecclesiastical principles. *Belgium* in 1896 relaxed somewhat its regulations regarding parental consent. The present law touching banns was a change in 1891 from the same law as that of France. *Bulgaria* supplemented the church law to some extent in 1897. *England* in 1907 abolished its law prohibiting marriage with a deceased wife's sister. In 1886 the hours for the celebration of marriage were changed from 8 A.M. to 12 M. to from 8 A.M. to 3 P.M. *Ireland* in 1870 extended the power to grant marriage licenses to certain chief officials of Protestant churches. *Canada* made marriage with a deceased wife's sister legal in 1882 and with a deceased wife's sister's daughter in 1890. In *Australia*, the marriage laws of *Western Australia*, which are practically the same as those of England, were consolidated in 1894. The Act of 1898 in *Victoria* restricted the right to perform the marriage ceremony to registered ministers of religion, the government statist, and any registrar of marriages. The Marriage Act of 1895 in *Tasmania* removed all restrictions on the hours for the celebration of marriages. In *New Zealand* marriage with a deceased husband's brother was made legal in 1901 and with a deceased wife's sister or niece in 1905. In *New South Wales* the law of 1899 makes the celebration of the marriage of minors a penal offense, but does not invalidate the marriage. In *France* in 1896 the necessity for the second and third request for parental consent to a marriage was made no longer obligatory, provided the parties whose consent is to be sought have not filed their objections within a month. *Germany*, as already noted, enacted a uniform marriage law in 1876. *Hungary* enacted a uniform marriage law in 1894, which took the

place of nine distinct systems, but which did not apply to *Croatia* and *Slavonia*, which have three systems to govern Catholics, Oriental Greeks, and Protestants and Jews. The civil code of marriage and divorce law for Japan, taking the place of the old social customs of the country, took effect July 16, 1898. Some changes were made in the marriage and divorce laws of *Sweden* in 1872, 1896, and 1898, but the digest fails to describe them. *Switzerland* enacted a uniform marriage and divorce law which went into effect January, 1876, taking the place of the cantonal laws, which were practically twenty-four systems.

SPECIAL STUDIES ON TOPICS OF THE FAMILY NEEDED.

The correspondence of the year shows a steady interest in the study of the family, especially in universities and women's clubs, and the study seems to improve in quality. But it is not always possible to give the material or references for which inquiry is made by those engaged in it. Here, for instance, is an inquiry for information on the relation of divorce and desertion to crime and pauperism. But there is almost none of value to be had. Another typical case is that of the editor of one of the most largely circulated periodicals in the country. He is getting many letters from women urging him to call attention to the number of divorces that are really due to diseases contracted from immoral husbands. He suspects that divorces from this cause are in reality very frequent. But he has no adequate data and we cannot give him any. The Secretary of the League has made some effort to learn the possibilities of a special investigation, either expert or official, that would cover this and many other of the hidden causes of divorce. The Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics might be directed to take up the investigation somewhat in the way in which it investigated intemperance as a cause of poverty, crime, and insanity, some years ago. But at present the Bureau has so much work thrust upon it that it did not seem wise to us at present to press the matter. But the investigation ought to come in some way. The results would necessarily be imperfect, but still of much value. We shall not lose sight of the object.

The economic cost of divorce and the other ills of defective family life needs attention. The cost to the country of a low or diseased family life must be enormous. Business men will do well to reflect on the fact.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON HOME EDUCATION.

A most important event of the year was the third International Congress on Home Education, held in Brussels August 21 to 25. The general object of these congresses is " to discuss the best means

of promoting the physical, moral, and intellectual well-being of children under home influence." At the request of the Belgian Minister at Washington, our Commissioner of Education, the Hon. Elmer E. Brown, secured the coöperation of an able committee and the attendance from the United States of a company of persons of authority in educational and home matters. Twelve hundred delegates from twenty countries were in attendance, and home education was treated from many points of view. It was decided to hold the next congress somewhere in the United States. A summary of the work of the congress at the Brussels meeting is given in ten pages of the first part of the Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1910, already issued.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND THE HOME.

Directly in this line is the decision of our own national Religious Education Association — Bishop Lawrence, president for the year — to devote its entire meeting, to be held in Providence February 14 to 16, to the religious needs of the home. These two coming meetings can hardly fail of giving a great impetus to a movement which thoughtful minds have been looking for, but which has been slow of popular recognition. On the whole, educational authorities have been much more keenly alive to the need of more attention to the home than have those of the church. The direction of the attention of the church to work through Sunday-schools and societies for young people has unconsciously turned attention for a generation or two away from the home as itself needing special care. Sooner or later, when we learn to apply the methods of study in social science to the social problems of religious organization, this difficulty will be remedied. Movements in one part of the social order as a whole cannot go on long without affecting more or less all the others.

THE FUTURE OF A WORK LIKE THAT OF THE LEAGUE.

The question is sometimes raised, Has the League or any other similar society a work to do beyond what has been accomplished in the last thirty years?

During this period statistical information for the civilized world has been officially collected, hundreds of improvements have been made in the marriage and divorce laws of our states, uniform laws have been prepared, the study of the family introduced into our higher educational institutions and made general in them, the churches have become in a degree aware of the needs at their hands of the home, the Home Department of the Sunday-school originated and given a half million members, and other things have come about along the general line of the family and home. In short, the subject

of the Family as a whole in which its special topics find their place has been pretty fairly opened. Perhaps this last is the most important gain of them all.

But why will not these interests take care of themselves now that the lines are laid and the work along them begun? Cannot some other organization take over the work of the League? Cannot there be a combination of the several societies that deal with child labor, cruelty to children, the homeless, the vices of sex, home study and the like? There is much waste in administration from so many appeals for money and from doing so many kinds of work separately. Some of these might be willing to take over the work of the League. But would they keep it on broad lines or would they not subordinate its comprehensive aims to their own special objects and so lose sight of the really inclusive problem? The comprehensive view the League has always taken seems to be abundantly justified by the results, as well as by the very nature of the case. As Mr. Bryce wrote, some years ago, "One might almost say that the Family is the fundamental and permanent problem of human society." The League has stood for that conception as no other society has yet done. Whatever may be the fate of the League, the position is too important to be abandoned or lost from sight. If some other organization can be found or formed that will take this position both theoretically and practically and hold the confidence of the most thoughtful students of the subject, let it by all means come to the front. The League will gladly turn over its work when such an opportunity appears. Until then, or support of our work fails, we do well to keep our place and do what we can in it. Another, and it is hoped more competent, Secretary must soon be found.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Last year we had an accrued debt of $559.65 due the Secretary. Our President, Mr. Low, surprised us at the last annual meeting with an offer to be responsible for one half the amount. Others present assumed responsibility for smaller sums. The effort was made to collect as much as possible of these pledges from outside parties in the hope of securing new contributors for the future. But a prolonged absence of Mr. Low in Europe and his many cares since his return, the ill-health or absence of others, led all to pay the sums they have pledged out of their own pockets. Several others of our regular contributors made special gifts for the purpose, and in this way fourteen persons paid the entire debt.

Meanwhile deaths among our older contributors, the growing necessity many have felt of reducing their contribution because of the great increase of appeals, and in some instances the working of apportionment plans by churches, have together made collections difficult. As usual, a goodly number of our regular contributors

respond promptly. But the delay of many to give until the very last of the year and the task of finding new donors make this part of the Secretary's work irksome.

The arrearage the first of December was so large that some of us felt that a dissolution of the League was inevitable. But when we saw that in that case the Corresponding Secretary would have much the same work coming to him in a private capacity, the alternative seemed to be that he should do what was to be done and take what came for his compensation, which he was willing to do. But during December, and though ill a greater part of the time, and in the few days after the close of the year, when the accounts were kept open, as we sometimes have done, the Secretary collected more than one third of all received in the year and enough to meet its expenses to within $114.65, which, of course, is the beginning of a new debt directly after paying off the old one. He cannot allow generous friends to repeat their sacrifice, especially as this is not the first time it has been made by them.

This frank statement is made that all may know the present condition. This report is submitted with gratitude for the privilege we have had of being in this work and for the hearty and prolonged interest that many have taken in it these thirty years.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

Receipts on account General Fund		$1 933 67
Receipts on account Debt		559 26
		$2 492 93
EXPENSES:		
Rent	$50 00	
Postage	40 77	
Telephone	8 45	
Church Almanac	50	
Traveling	44 20	
Stationery and printing	103 65	
Express	75	
	$248 32	
Paid Rev. S. W. Dike on account Debt	559 26	
		807 58
Applied to salary of Rev. S. W. Dike, Secretary		$1 685 35
Deficit for year ending December 31, 1910		$114 65

FEBRUARY 2, 1911.

I have this day examined the foregoing accounts of the Treasurer for the year ending December 31, 1910, with vouchers for the same, and find them correct.

W. B. HERRICK, *Auditor.*

RECEIPTS.

Jan.	1.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	$10 00	
	4.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	50 00	
	6.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	1 00	
	13.	Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	14.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Center	5 00	
	19.	Mrs. Frederick Billings, New York, N. Y.	100 00	
	20.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
	20.	Rev. Charles G. Ames, Boston	5 00	
	20.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., Cambridge	5 00	
	26.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	2 00	
	28.	Pres. W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center	5 00	
	21.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
		Total received in quarter		$243 00
Feb.	7.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	$10 00	
	10.	First Congregational Church, Natick	5 00	
	14.	Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	14.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	

Feb.	16.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	$5 00	
	16.	Prof. Henry W. Farnam, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
	16.	Rt. Rev. Daniel Tuttle, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	16.	Mrs. William G. Benedict, Boston	5 00	
	17.	Rev. William P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00	
	17.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
	18.	Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
	19.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	19.	Pres. Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D. C.	10 00	
	21.	Rt. Rev. John Scarborough, D.D., Trenton, N. J.	10 00	
	22.	George D. Rand, Auburndale	2 00	
	23.	Mrs. George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
	23.	James C. Braman, Bangor, Me.	10 00	
	23.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., Boston	25 00	
	25.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00	
	25.	Prof. Walter F. Willcox, LL.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
	26.	State Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me.	10 00	
	26.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	10 00	
	26.	Prof. Austin B. Bassett, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
	26.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	28.	Arba N. Lincoln, Fall River	5 00	
	28.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
		Total received in February		$270 00
Mar.	2.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	$10 00	
	7.	Mrs. Morris K. Jesup, New York	10 00	
	8.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	10.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00	
	10.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	10.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	14.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00	
	14.	Rev. George L. Paine, Dorchester	5 00	
	18.	"In Memoriam," Stockbridge	25 00	
	21.	Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00	
	25.	Dr. H. Sterling Pomeroy, Auburndale	5 00	
	25.	Mrs. Louisa T. Dickerman, Boston	10 00	
	25.	The Very Rev. A. St. John Chambre, D.D., Lowell.	10 00	
		Total received in March		$135 00
April	4.	Major Mary A. Wagner, Detroit, Mich.	$1 00	
	8.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	10 00	
		Total received in April		$11 00
May	3.	Edward W. Bok, Philadelphia, Pa.	$25 00	
	3.	C. E. Clift, Arlington	5 00	
	3.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
	3.	J. Randolph Coolidge, Boston	25 00	
	26.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York	25 00	
	26.	Prof. Samuel Hart, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	30.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
		Total received in May		$120 00
June	4.	Broadway Tabernacle, New York	$10 00	
	4.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00	
		Total received in June		$15 00
July	1.	Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Pa.	$25 00	
	7.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.	15 00	
	8.	Rev. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	10 00	
	12.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	22.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	10 00	
		Total received in July		$85 00

Aug.	1.	J. D. R. Lamson, Toledo, Ohio	$10 00	
	26.	" A Friend," Haddam, Conn.	6 00	
	27.	Walter V. Bowns, San Francisco, Cal.	6 25	
		Total received in August		$22 25
Sept.	19.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	$2 00	
	20.	F. B. Marsh, New York	10 00	
		Total received in September		$12 00
Oct.	1.	Herbert A. Wilder, Newton	$10 00	
	3.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D., Boston	5 00	
	8.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
	27.	Messrs. Ginn & Co., Boston	10 00	
	29.	St. John's Parish, Stamford, Conn.	7 42	
	29.	Miss Elizabeth Baer, Wellesley	1 00	
		Total in October		$43 42
Nov.	3.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	$5 00	
	3.	First Baptist Church, Newton Center	25 00	
	7.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester	10 00	
	7.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00	
	14.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	5 00	
	15.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York	30 00	
	15.	Edward P. Dutton, New York	10 00	
	16.	Miss Lucy W. Burr, Auburndale	25 00	
	17.	Dr. William C. Rives, Washington, D. C.	5 00	
	19.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00	
	22.	Trinity Church, Boston	25 00	
	23.	W. W. Lockwood, New York	5 00	
	24.	Prof. William North Rice, LL.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	24.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	26.	Miss Grace H. Dodge, New York	100 00	
	28.	Robert C. Ogden, New York	25 00	
	30.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester, Mass.	3 00	
		Total in November		$308 00
Dec.	2.	Hon. Robert H. Gardiner, Boston	$10 00	
	2.	Rev. William C. Gordon, Ph.D., Auburndale	5 00	
	3.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	3.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	50 00	
	6.	Rev. Samuel C. Bushnell, Arlington	5 00	
	7.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	7.	Rev. Thomas W. Nickerson, Pittsfield	10 00	
	7.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00	
	8.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	8.	Rev. Herbert W. Lathe, Prescott, Ariz.	5 00	
	12.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	2 00	
	13.	Church of the Ascension, New York	25 00	
	13.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	25 00	
	13.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
	14.	Hon. John E. Parsons, New York	25 00	
	15.	" Friends," Thompson, Conn	8 00	
	16.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00	
	19.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00	
	19.	St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	19.	Prof. Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	20.	Rev. William J. Tucker, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	10 00	
	20.	" A Friend," Brookline	20 00	
	21.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston	5 00	

Dec.	21.	Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.,	$10 00	
	22.	William H. Swift, Pittsfield	25 00	
	23.	Hon. William B. Plunkett, Adams	10 00	
	24.	Rt. Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio	10 00	
	24.	Mrs. David P. Kimball, Boston	25 00	
	26.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00	
	26.	Prof. Leverett W. Spring, D.D., Boston	5 00	
	29.	Miss Maria R. Hicks, Fall River	5 00	
	30.	State Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me.	10 00	
	31.	Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., New York	10 00	
	31.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	31.	Pres. George E. Horr, D.D., Newton Center	5 00	
	31.	Prof. Melancthon W. Jacobus, D.D., LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	31.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, N. Y.	50 00	
	31.	Rt. Rev. Frederick Burgess, D.D., Garden City, N. Y.	5 00	
	31.	Arthur C. Farley, Wellesley Hills	5 00	
	31.	Prof. W. N. Donovan, Newton Center	2 00	
	31.	St. John's Church, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	31.	President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst	5 00	
	31.	Jerome C. Borden, Fall River	5 00	
	31.	Arthur S. Johnson, Boston	10 00	
	31.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	31.	Prof. Theodore D. Woolsey, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	15 00	
	31.	Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Auburndale	25 00	
	31.	Rev. Cornelius B. Patton, D.D., Newton	5 00	
	31.	Hon. Elbridge Torrey, Boston	10 00	
	31.	Hon. Arthur W. Wellman, Boston	5 00	
	31.	G. M. Winslow, Auburndale	5 00	
	31.	Henry B. Day, West Newton	25 00	
	31.	G. Henry Whitcomb, Worcester	25 00	
		Total received in December		$669 00

Special Receipts for the Debt due January 1, 1910.

Jan.	28.	President W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Boston	$5 00	
	29.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, Worcester	10 00	
	31.	Miss Grace Dodge, New York	50 00	
Feb.	16.	Rt. Rev. D. S. Tuttle, D.D., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	18.	Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Hartford, Conn.	2 00	
	22.	Prof. F. G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	50 00	
Mar.	3.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., Cambridge	10 00	
	3.	Through Rt. Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Springfield,	25 00	
April	8.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York	279 63	
June	4.	Church of the Ascension, New York	25 00	
	11.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	50 00	
	17.	Rev. C. F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	2 50	
July	12.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York	25 00	
Nov.	15.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York	20 00	
		To balance account	13	
		Total		$559 26

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protcct the institution of the Family, cspecially as affectcd by existing evils relating to Marriagc and Divorce, and to secure its propcr efficicncy in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The offieers of this society shall be a President, not more than five Viee-Prcsidents, a Rccording Secretary, a Corresponding Seeretary, a Treasurer, and an Exeeutive Committee of not morc than twclve persons, of whieh eommittee the Corresponding Sccretary shall be a mcmber, and of which not less than three shall constitutc a quorum, having the dutics indieated in their several offiees, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold offiee until their sueccssors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by thc Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indieated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notiee shall have bcen given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such mceting by the vote of two thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS eoneerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Seeretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a eorporation created by the Laws of the State of Conneeticut, or its sueeessor or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of whieh is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.